



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1878-9.

## MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

(From the autograph register.)

---

Stephen Pearl Andrews, New York, N. Y.  
William Hyde Appleton, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.  
Albert N. Arnold, Pawtuxet, R. I.  
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
L. H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.  
W. C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Albert S. Cook, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
Martin L. D'Ooge, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
T. T. Eaton, Petersburg, Va. .  
James M. Garnett, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.  
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
W. W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
A. Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
M. W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.  
Mary H. Ladd, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.  
Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Robert F. Leighton, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.  
F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
A. C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
Wilfred H. Munro, Bristol, R. I.  
C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.  
Charles P. Otis, Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.  
L. R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
Tracy Peck, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.  
J. B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass.  
T. D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio.  
William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.  
Crawford H. Toy, Norfolk, Va.  
Julia E. Ward, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.  
Benjamin I. Wheeler, High School, Providence, R. I.  
J. Colver Wightman, Taunton, Mass.  
Alonzo Williams, Brown University, Providence, R. I.

## AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

NEWPORT, R. I., Tuesday, July 15, 1879.

The Eleventh Annual Session was called to order at 3 o'clock P.M., in the hall of the Rogers High School, by the President, Mr. Jotham B. Sewall, of Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.

An address of welcome was made by His Excellency Governor Van Zandt, to which the President replied.

Mr. Sewall announced the death of the Secretary, Professor Thomas C. Murray, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., and the appointment of Professor Charles R. Lanman, of the same institution, to serve in his stead from March until the next election of officers.

The Treasurer, Charles J. Buckingham, Esq., presented his report, showing the receipts and expenditures of the past year. [See p. 38.]

The Chair then appointed Professor A. C. Merriam and Professor J. M. Garnett a committee to audit the Treasurer's report.

The Secretary *pro tempore*, Professor Lanman, presented a report from the Executive Committee, announcing the prompt publication of the Transactions for 1878, and the election to membership of

Professor Albert S. Cook, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. ; Professor Walter Q. Scott, Wooster University, Wooster, Ohio; Rev. Ambrose J. Faust, Ph.D., Washington, D.C. ; and Mr. Joseph R. Anderson, Jr., Richmond, Va.

On motion, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Professor C. H. Toy, and Professor F. A. March were appointed a committee to draw up resolutions in commemoration of the late Professor Murray.

On motion, Professor F. A. March, Mr. Charles J. Buckingham, and Colonel John R. Leslie were appointed a committee to arrange the hours for the sessions.

The first paper was by Dr. E. G. Sihler, of New York, on "The Critical and Rhetorical Labors of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and

the *Ars Rhetorica*." In the absence of the author, it was read by the Secretary.

I. The extant rhetorical and critical works of Dionysius were all written at Rome, with one probable exception. They are not a continuous and systematic exposition of rhetorical theory and practice, but detached treatises illustrating the mature convictions and tenets of the practical teacher. Mr. Sihler endeavored to explain the principles and practices therein embodied. Of the latter, the most important is the Atticism of Dionysius, the rigorous and absolute exclusion of any models but the standard-bearers of classic Attic prose, of the century from Andocides to Demosthenes. The practical instruction of Dionysius was therefore necessarily merged into literary criticism. His criticism, again, to be appreciated, must be judged from the one-sided, practical (non-historical) stand-point of its author. The degree of suitability of the several classic Attic authors for practical imitation and the purposes of rhetorical culture seems to have served as the basis of Dionysius' canon. This explains his strictures on the orations in Thucydides, on the fullness and poetical flights of Plato, and on the padding and the monotonous rise and fall of the Isocratean periods.

What we may call the *system* of Dionysius was then set forth: viz., 1. His *σύνθεσις* or construction, rising from the analysis of sounds and the metrical consideration of prosody in prose to that of clauses and periods; 2. His diction and vocabulary (*ὀνόματα*).

II. Very many critics have denied the Dionysian authorship of the so-called *Ars Rhetorica*. It is an aggregate of detached pieces referring exclusively to the epideictic kind of oratory. It holds in high esteem the models of Plato and Isocrates. The former of these is often imitated in minute terms and phrases, and even Demosthenes is made an imitator of Plato.

Mr. Sihler suggested that the *Ars* may have been a performance of the younger years of Dionysius, written in his Greek home (this piece alone is dedicated to a man bearing a Greek name); and that the Lysianic and Demosthenian standard influencing the other and later writings of Dionysius may to some extent be due to his association and close coöperation with the Atticist and purist, Caecilius of Calacte.

Mr. Stephen Pearl Andrews, of New York City, read a paper on "Ideological Etymology as a distinct Method in Philology."

Mr. Andrews' paper concerned the classification of words on the basis of the *Ideas* which they express. He stated as a fact that from Jacob Grimm to August Fick, the opposite method of etymology, that of classifying words upon the basis of their phonetic structure and affiliations, had exclusively prevailed, as if there were no other possible method. Still, it is perfectly obvious, on reflection, that every etymological process has two factors, or concerns itself with two things: first, the words in question, as *phonetic structures* or bundles of sounds; and secondly, the *deas* involved, the *meanings* of the words; and that either of these two

may be given the first rank, and the other be subordinated to it. Consequently, there are two elementary methods of etymologizing possible, besides an ulterior compound method resulting from the coaction of the former two.

For example, *break*, *breech*, and *brag* are three words which have a certain double relation to each other: first, phonetically, which is pointed out when we say that *k*, *ch*, and *g* are consonant sounds capable of being interchanged by certain phonetic laws (and so of the vowels, *ea*, *ee*, and *a*); so that one or another of these words is, presumably, an earlier form, and the other two later, and derived from it. This is the prevalent, and what we may call the Historical, Physical, or German Method of etymological investigation.

But we may consider the whole matter from the opposite point of view, thus: A *breach* is something *brok-en*, or which has undergone the process of *break-ing*. *Breach* is, therefore, a derivative *idea* from *break*, and the phonetic similarity of the two words may be *incidentally alluded to*, as a consequence of this natural alliance of the two ideas. So, to *brag* is to *break out*, to *throw one's self* into notice (Lat. *jacto*), and the similarity of the word *brag* to *breach* and *break* may be again incidentally brought in, to illustrate and confirm the natural or inherent alliance of the three ideas. This latter method, which deals with *the nature and affiliations of ideas or meanings, as embodied in words*, as of the first importance, and of the phonetic phenomena of the words as secondary, is the New Method now proposed, which Mr. Andrews calls Ideological or Psychical, or again, the American Method. In this latter case, there is a distinct place for a Science of Ideology, as underlying and controlling the study of the higher aspects of Etymology; but an Ideology, still, studied and perfected through the reflex potency of the direct study of words, and hence not merely metaphysical, but distinctly philological.

Mr. Andrews does not wish it to be understood that the term American Method has reference to himself (and his own nationality) as the first to propound it, as a distinct method; it is a recognition of the merits, in this regard, of Noah Webster, who somewhat unconsciously inaugurated it when he reduced the *meanings* of the verbs of the English and allied languages to thirty-four in number (see Introduction to Webster's Dictionary). Mr. Andrews, taking his departure from this spontaneous first effort, of Webster, in the right direction, analyzes and further generalizes *his* thirty-four classes of ideas, reducing them all to no more than three grand major classes: 1. The idea of *division* or *apartness* (of, off, from), Spencer's *Differentiation*; 2. The idea of *unity* or *togetherness* (at, to, with), Spencer's *Integration*; and, 3. The idea of transition or vacillation between these two (over, through, across, between).

The gist or core of Mr. Andrews' paper, which was long and elaborate, dealing extensively with the Indo-European Roots, is contained in the two following propositions:

I. The Prepositions (as the words of *Relation*) contain in themselves or represent *all the primitive ideas*, from which *are derived* the meanings of all the other parts of speech (or words in language).

II. The Prepositions themselves, though very few in all languages, are nevertheless susceptible of being reduced, in respect to their meanings, to a very much smaller group, ending, indeed, in the absolutely fundamental difference between *of* and *at* (or *from* and *to*), and their hinge-wise connection with each other (between, etc.).

A recess was then taken from 5 until 8 o'clock.

NEWPORT, Tuesday, July 15, 1879.

#### EVENING SESSION.

The Association met at 8.15.

The Annual Address was delivered by the President, Mr. Jotham B. Sewall.

After some congratulatory words by way of introduction, "Our Duty to our Mother Tongue," was announced as subject.

First. As to its purity. Ought we to labor for it? We wish to speak a pure language and to maintain its purity. But what does "purity of the English language" mean? If we mean by it freedom from admixture with other languages, it is to be remembered that there is no such thing as an English language by itself, simple and pure. From the time when it could first properly be called "the English language," it has been a composite. Trench's estimate is sixty parts Anglo-Saxon, thirty Latin, five Greek, and five parts from other languages. The Anglo-Saxon is the chief part. The other parts have been added and assimilated, a process not of a moment and then done, but still going on and always to go on as long as English-speaking people are active-minded and inventive, and come to need terms which their own tongue does not supply. The purity of the English language, therefore, does not require an obstinate resistance to the admission of words from a foreign source, nor to the formation of new ones. Indeed, it would be useless, because a resistance of the law of growth. A needed word, or an apt one, must and will come. All that can be meant by "purity of the English language," besides this, is freedom from pedantry, vulgarisms, and barbarisms, and its correct use, and distinct and full enunciation as a written and spoken language. And for this, obviously, it is important to labor.

Second. As to its restoration. By this is meant the bringing forward of the Anglo-Saxon element to such predominance as to displace the other elements as far as possible—indeed, completely. The advocates of restoration wish to bring back and re-instate the language of England in the time of Alfred the Great as the English language, and banish Latin, Greek, and all other elements from use. There arise two questions: Can it be done? and, Is it desirable? As to the first, a work so completely revolutionary would seem impossible. Not that the laws of the growth and change of language would have to be set aside, but that the manipulation required is a greater one than could possibly be brought into exercise. Something, much indeed, is possible if desirable. The law of stimulus avails here as

well as elsewhere, and influence can be exerted upon language for its growth and change as upon other things. An eminent illustration of this is the act of Edward III. (whereby English was substituted for Norman-French in law use), and its result. If an increased interest in the study of Early English should arise and the English language should take a more important place in the studies of our higher schools and colleges, the knowledge thus more commonly acquired would put the earlier language back within more common reach, and familiarity with its store of words would tend to bring back into use all such as were apt and needed; and if it proved as available a source for new terms as the Greek or Latin, it would naturally be so employed. We resort to Greek and Latin for new words, not so much because they are a superior store-house of material, but because their superior place in our methods of education has made them more familiar and put them within easier reach. Is it then desirable? The revolutionary work aimed at by some is not desirable. There is neither reason nor sense in shutting ourselves out from other stores and denying ourselves the liberty of borrowing and assimilating from other languages, if we wish. Why deny the discoverer and the scientist their resource in the Greek, or refuse to accept so apt a word as *cañon* from the Spanish, or even *taboo* from the savages of Polynesia? We shall not all allow that the contributions to the English from other languages have not been an enrichment rather than otherwise. Nevertheless, has not something been lost which it would be well to regain, and is there not a labor in this direction worth performing to avail ourselves of the riches of strength and beauty which once dwelt in the tongue? From the nature of things, the language of the tenth century could not be the language of the nineteenth, and the labor to make it so would be an attempt to do the impossible. There was, however, an undue influence exerted upon the language from exterior sources: first, through the Norman conquest; and secondly, through the advent of the "new learning," to the detriment of the language as the language of the English. There was a loss on the Anglo-Saxon side, and while we take the position that *purity* does not require of us unyielding resistance to the income of foreign words, we may also take the position that we may well labor to recover what has been lost. No one needs to be convinced that simplicity, strength, and beauty will be gained by the recovery of old English words.

Third. As to its orthography. There is need of reform. Our orthography is truly a kakography. What are the objections to reform? Nun, save prejudice and inertia. But these are great obstacles. They will yield only to rationally directed and unremitting effort. Something will be gained perhaps by the introduction of new characters for sounds represented by several letters. Something too may be done by returning to the original spelling of words which have been corrupted.

Fourth. As to its study. Our mother tongue has not the place it ought to have in the curricula of our schools and colleges. It ought to have a place of equal importance with any. Considering it as a language, and its stores of history, poetry, oratory, etc., why should not a man of equal abilities be able to do as much with it for himself as Demosthenes did for



himself with his mother tongue? In these days of March, Morris, Skeat, and others, there is no want of means and instrumentalities. Aside from the direct results which it is easy to see would flow from the study of English with the same thoroughness and exactness which are now given to Greek and Latin as to discipline and culture, obvious arguments in its favor are to be found in the aid thus furnished to the work in behalf of purity, restoration, and reform of orthography. Indeed, it is easy to see, how, beginning with a historical study of the language, a logically connected and well-defined course might be laid out, embracing literature, rhetoric, and logic, and ending in these.

Professor A. C. Merriam, of Columbia College, New York City, then read a paper "On some Passages of the *Odyssey*."

It has appeared to some weak and pointless to tell Nausicaa, ζ 35, either that she is a Phaeacian, or that she is noble, and this consideration has led Bekker to omit the line. On the contrary, it was argued in this paper that the poet had composed the line for the specific purpose of hinting that the princess was wooed by *native suitors and those only*, and thus to intimate at this early stage how distasteful they are to her, and the effect which the coming of Odysseus may produce. For, the distinction in Greece between the aristocracy and the royal family was so broad a one in the Homeric period that the latter were accustomed to contract a marriage only with royalty beyond their own borders, as is the custom among the reigning families of Europe at the present day. Since Phaeacian manners and customs are essentially Greek, simply a trifle more god-favored and effeminate, the same custom may be supposed to obtain in Scheria. Indeed, there is presumptive evidence of this in the history of the royal family. Nausithous, a grandson of the king of the Giants, becomes king of the Phaeacians perhaps by marriage, as Menelaus obtains the throne in Sparta. His son Rhexenor may likewise have married from a distance before their removal to Scheria, but he dies young, leaving an only child, Arete. Soon after, the migration probably took place to their isolated home in Scheria, and there Alcinous, loath to wed among the aristocracy, in time, partly driven by the custom and their isolation, matches with royalty by espousing his niece Arete. Compare the case of the sons of Aeolus, κ 5-7. Two sons of Alcinous have taken wives in Scheria, but there was no other resource if they were to be married at all. Yet there remains a lingering hope in the family that for the only daughter, the darling of them all, some Nausithous may be thrown in their way by Providence, and she may thus be rescued from the nobles she despises, and sustain the dignity of her station. It is such a state of affairs that the line in question seems to disclose by reminding us that she is wooed by native suitors, and if so, it is far from weak and pointless, since it explains the uttered wish of the princess, ζ 244-5, that Odysseus might remain and become her husband—lines which were rejected by Aristarchus as too bold to suit the maidenly character of Nausicaa; but it is to be observed that they are spoken to her attendants, and the position of the group is such that they are quite out of earshot of Odysseus. The thought of her approaching

marriage is continually before her, and is naturally a subject of frequent conversation between herself and her maids. The change wrought in the squalid sea-waif has been so wondrous that he must needs have been sent by Heaven to their land, a thought which awakens at once the hope that he may be the *one* looked for to bring her deliverance from an alliance beneath her dignity. He has already hinted his former importance in the world, and it is not unusual in the poems to find the outer comeliness taken to argue mental and moral qualities of worth, which in this case have been proved as well by his speech as by his bearing throughout. All this conspires to present the thought to her in the light of a possibility, and the frankness of her nature reveals it to her companions, but the poet has been careful that it shall not reach the ears of Odysseus.

Again, closely connected with these two passages are the lines ζ 276-88, which were likewise rejected by some of the ancient commentators for the same reason as 244-5. But Goethe, with his true poetic instinct and clear insight into the workings of the human heart, has divined the real character of the maiden, and vindicated both the passage and the purpose of the elder poet. Besides a frankness and a *naïveté* so open that the thoughts which spring in the heart fall naturally from the lips, Homer here develops more fully, though covertly and by the dramatic method, that predilection for Odysseus which has already been seen to be springing up in the maiden's breast. It is this first feeling of love which makes her so sensitive to the thought of the gossiping tongue that would couple her name with Odysseus, and the poet with consummate art has veiled it carefully by causing the maiden to put into the mouth of another what she censures in her words, though she wishes in her heart. An engaging forwardness is thus rescued from the verge of boldness by an expedient which Pope declares to be "an instance of the great art of Homer in saying everything properly." These lines, too, contain as a whole the strongest confirmatory evidence of the theory advanced on 35. Nitzsch would retain the remainder of the passage, while disposed to reject 280-1; but these are exactly to the point. Despairing of a release from the threatened indignity, the maiden's prayer turns even to the gods. Nor need such a prayer be considered as presumptuous on her part. Poseidon himself is her great-grandfather, and the gods are wont to come familiarly to fraternize and feast with the Phaeacians who are of their kin. The poet who represents the sea-nymph Thetis as married to Peleus and living for many years in his palace, would surely feel no difficulty in the idea of such a union among the semi-divine Phaeacians. In fact we have a similar prayer from the Greek Antiope of the Odyssey, λ 261.

Lastly, η 311-16 was discussed. These six lines fell under the suspicions of Aristarchus, and doubtless because of Alcinous' startling offer of his daughter's hand to a total stranger; but the king is plainly quite captivated by the commanding presence and bearing of his guest, and by the eloquence and delicacy of sentiment he has displayed. His high station in life has been directly asserted, and the immortality which Calypso designed for him argued a lofty lineage befitting such a fate and such a love. His sentiments have already met the approval of the courtiers, and

though Alcinous dissents from the thought that he might be angered at Odysseus' return with Nausicaa, yet he respects and approves the delicacy that prompted the action of the hero, to the degree that he feels assured that Odysseus' feelings are at one with his bearing and eloquence. To infer kingly station in a stranger from his appearance and comportment only is not confined to the impetuous Alcinous in the *Odyssey*; cf.  $\delta$  63,  $\nu$  223,  $\omega$  253. A fair parallel to the case of Alcinous was cited from the Gaelic poem of "Evir-allen," claimed to have been discovered by Baron de Harold in Ireland and translated by him. That Alcinous believes Odysseus to be no impostor, but the hero his words and appearance proclaim, he tells us himself  $\lambda$  363-7. When to all this there is added the strong predilection to a foreign marriage with royalty, the offer from so impetuous a person loses its startling features, and becomes eminently characteristic of the man. That the offer is not pressed is doubtless due to a strong gesture of dissent from Odysseus at  $\eta$  315. No allusion is made to it later, and on the following day it is assumed by king and court that Odysseus has a wife and family. The princess, too, has settled back to the same conviction, and her few simple words of parting are tinged with the melancholy of a shattered hope, though her dream had been all too short to leave a sting behind. Homer has not handled this episode as many a follower of his has done. Here we have no Medea, no Dido, no—but their name is legion. It was quite within his purpose to enthrall us with his beautiful creation of the Phaeacians, but it must in no wise thwart the grander scheme of his greater epic.

In relation to the theory advanced this much was claimed: For three long-suspected passages it supplies a thread that runs through them all, knitting them together into unity and coherence, and connecting them back to a fourth to which it gives a weight and significance that can scarcely be overestimated, standing where it does and striking the keynote of so many strains throughout the whole episode.

The committee on the hours of meeting reported. The report was accepted with slight amendment, so that the hours were arranged as follows: from 9 o'clock to 1; from 4 to 6; and from 8 to 10.

The Association adjourned to 9 o'clock, Wednesday morning.

NEWPORT, Wednesday, July 16, 1879.

#### MORNING SESSION.

The Association resumed its session at 9.20 A. M., the President, Mr. Sewall, in the chair.

The appointed committee presented the following resolution commemorative of the late Professor Murray, which was unanimously adopted:

The American Philological Association desire to give expression to their sense of the eminent services of their late Secretary, Professor

Thomas Chalmers Murray, and to their deep sorrow at his untimely death.\* From the beginning of his connection with this Association Professor Murray showed on every occasion the utmost readiness to further the interests of our body, and as Secretary distinguished himself by his promptness, his accuracy, and his uniform kindness. A scholar of rare attainments, an investigator of great acuteness and excellent balance, an admirable expositor of the results of his studies, a teacher of unusual power and suggestiveness, Professor Murray seemed destined to eminence in his chosen department; but by the members of this Association his memory will be cherished especially for his faithful discharge of duty and his winning and self-sacrificing courtesy. Therefore,

*Resolved*, That this testimony to the worth of Professor Murray be entered upon the proceedings of the Association and a copy be sent to the surviving members of his family.

The Secretary announced, in the name of the Executive Committee, the election of six new members:

Mr. John Tetlow, Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass.; Mr. Wilfred H. Munro, Bristol, R. I.; Mr. William C. Collar, Boston, Mass.; Dr. George W. Ingraham, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.; Mr. Benjamin I. Wheeler, Providence High School, Providence, R. I.; Mr. Edwin De Meritte, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.

On motion, Professor W. W. Goodwin, Professor M. L. D'Ooge, and Professor E. P. Crowell were appointed a committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

On motion, Professor L. R. Packard, Professor T. D. Seymour, and Professor Samuel Hart were appointed a committee to recommend a suitable time and place for the next meeting.

Professor M. W. Humphreys, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., read a paper on "The Nature of Caesura."

1. Caesura serves two general purposes: (*a*) in long verses it gives the reciter an opportunity to inhale, but falling in the midst of a foot prevents him from taking too much time; and (*b*) it serves as a *vinculum* to hold the two portions of the verse together, and *does not separate them*. In short verses, the latter is the chief office of caesura, and hence it can fall between words closely connected: between the subject and the verb, e. g., Theb. 15; between the verb and its object, *ibid.* 270; between an adjective and its substantive, *ibid.* 18; between the article and its substantive, Philoct. 964; after a preposition, Oed. Rex 615; after *οὐ*, Iph. in Taur. 684; before *μὲν*, *γὰρ*, etc., Orest. 360; even before an enclitic, a break is better than no caesura, e. g., Ion 574; and in other similar positions it

---

\*Mr. Murray was Professor of Shemitic Languages at the Johns Hopkins University. After an illness of a week, he died at Baltimore on the 20th of March, 1879, aged 29 years. He left in manuscript a course of lectures on The Poetical Books of the Old Testament, soon to be published; papers on The Home of the Shemitic Peoples, and on The Original Case-Form in Shemitic; and a work on Hebrew Synonyms, well advanced towards completion.

must be recognized. If it be claimed that such verses lack chief caesura, we refer to verses which are admitted always to have a fixed caesura or incision, as the trochaic tetram. cat.; cf. Troades 454, 458, etc., etc. In 454, it falls before an enclitic; this is not so surprising when we consider that a grammatical pause may immediately precede an enclitic; as, Androm. 747; Hec. 432, etc. Many other arguments to sustain such caesurae are here omitted, and many illustrations from Latin, and from the so-called dactylic pentameter. The examples are very numerous, those cited above being mere illustrations.

2. It is *not* necessary that a break, to constitute a genuine caesura, must follow a polysyllabic word; but in some verses an incision or diaeresis immediately before a chief caesura is objectionable. This is proved by many examples taken from authors who otherwise never neglect caesura: as, e. g.,

Quid amplius vis? || O mare et terra, ardeo.

3. The last section of the paper contained strictures on Hermann's ridiculing hephthemimeral caesura in trimeters and J. H. H. Schmidt's rejecting the penthemimeral.

Dr. Robert F. Leighton, of Brooklyn, N. Y., then read "An Account of a New Manuscript of Cicero's Letters *ad Familiares*."

Scholars have felt renewed interest in Cicero's letters *ad Familiares* since the discovery of the manuscript of these letters at Vercelli in 1474. But little is known of the history of this original MS., except that it is the oldest MS. of these letters now known. The question has long been agitated whether this MS.—the *codex Mediceus* xlix, No. ix, now in the Laurentian library at Florence—is the only standard in determining the text of these letters, or if other MSS. exist whose text is independent of this, and can therefore serve as a means of comparison and correction. Orelli, after a critical examination of all the MSS. in Italy and Germany known to him, maintained that, with the exception of one page of a Turin palimpsest, all MSS. of the letters *ad Fam.*, were directly or indirectly copies of the Mediceus. Baiter agrees with Orelli; Hofmann, however, considers the *codex Parisinus* Notre Dame 178, to be of independent authority for the books which it contains: viz., i to viii, 8, 6 as far as the words *impediendi moram*. In 1827, the Erfurt MS. was discovered, and Orelli pronounced it a copy of the Mediceus; but Meyneke and Buecheler after a critical examination proved that it was independent of the Mediceus. The passage chiefly relied on by M. and B. was *ad Fam.* xv, 2, 5, where, instead of the one word *cohortatus*, the five words *et tamen adolescentem essem cohortatus* are found. Orelli had noticed this; but he regarded the words as a gloss of *cohortatus*.

In 1874, M. Thurot had the Tour MS. brought to Paris and examined. This MS. had been known since 1829, having been mentioned by Haenel (Cic. quaest. acad. crit. Ep. ad Fam., Sec. xii, m. 4—p. 482); but Orelli contested the date assigned to this MS.; the other editors of Cicero's letters have not even mentioned it. M. Thurot proved that it is a copy dating from the twelfth century, and that it is independent of the Mediceus.

In 1839, Oehler called the attention of Orelli to the *codices Harleiani* in the British Museum; but these MSS. remained unnoticed until 1874, when Franz Rühl gave a brief account of them in a note to Ritschl, published in *Rhein. Mus.*, vol. 30, pp. 26 et sq.

In 1876, the writer had an opportunity to examine these two *codices*, and carefully collated them. They were purchased by Lord Harley in 1750, and were brought to England from the monastery of Cusa, in Holland. One is from the eleventh century (*codex Harlejanus* 2683), and the other (*codex Harlejanus* 2773), from the twelfth century. They are beyond a doubt independent of the Mediceus. In xv, 2, 5 are, besides the word *cohortatus*, the same four words chiefly relied on by Meyncke and Buecheler to prove the independence of the Erfurt MS. A number of passages from these letters where the text is doubtful were quoted, and the value of these new MSS. proved by the aid they furnish in revising the text. The reading of several passages which have hitherto baffled the ingenuity of critics is satisfactorily settled by these new MSS. The conclusion is that all known MSS. of these letters are either copies of the Mediceus, or like the *codd. Par.*, *Erfurt.*, *Harl. primus et secundus* and *Turonensis*, independent of the Mediceus, but copies of the same archetype, and therefore serviceable in correcting the Mediceus and thus settling the original text of these letters.

Professor Albert Harkness, of Brown University, Providence, R. I., read a paper on "The Development of the Latin Subjunctive in Principal Clauses."

The paper aimed to show the steps by which the various meanings of this mood as seen in Latin authors were developed out of the simple etymological force of its original form. The Latin subjunctive contains both the forms and the meanings of two moods, originally distinct, the subjunctive proper with the sign *a* and the optative with the sign *i*. These forms, however, are used without any difference of meaning, and are made to supplement each other. While, therefore, in Sanskrit and Greek the subjunctive and optative meanings are denoted by separate forms, in Latin they are both expressed by the same form. Moreover the subjunctive and optative forms in Latin supply the place of the future indicative in the regular verbs of the third and fourth conjugations. What now is the explanation of this remarkable confusion in the use of forms, a confusion so great that different forms, subjunctive and optative, occur with the same meaning and the same form with different meanings? In this singular anomaly we recognize an important historical fact in the development of moods. It shows that when the Latin first became a separate language, the forms of the subjunctive and optative, and of the future indicative were used with little or no difference of meaning, a view fully confirmed by the etymology of the forms themselves. The subjunctive and the optative moods are in their origin only special developments of certain forms of the present indicative, and originally denoted continued or prolonged action, from which was developed the idea of effort—attempted action. But earnest effort readily suggests on the one hand *desire*, as we strive only for that which we desire

to attain, and on the other *possibility* or *probability*, as we may very likely accomplish that which we are already attempting.

But secondly, what relation does this etymological meaning of these forms sustain to the meaning actually found in the works of Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin authors? If we have interpreted the etymology aright, we must not expect to find any broad and well-defined line of distinction between the provinces originally occupied respectively by the indicative and the subjunctive. Accordingly, in the Vedas and the Homeric poems, our earliest specimens of Sanskrit and Greek, we often meet with the subjunctive in senses much more closely related to that of the future indicative than in later authors. Indeed, in the works of Homer, the aorist subjunctive and the future indicative are often identical in form and so closely related in meaning that it is not always possible to distinguish one from the other. But the Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit all conform to the same analogy in the use of moods. Indeed, the use of subjunctive and optative forms to supply the place of the future indicative does not differ at all in kind from the Homeric use of similar forms in a future sense. It is in fact simply the result of carrying out the analogy on a large scale. In all these facts we discern the germ from which was developed the *potential* subjunctive.

But the Latin subjunctive, like the Sanskrit and Greek subjunctive and optative, also denotes *desire*, *wish*, a meaning which like the potential may be readily developed out of the etymological signification of the forms. Indeed, in the Vedas and the Homeric poems, as well as in the early Latin, we sometimes find the subjunctive of desire apparently in the very first stage of its development, scarcely distinguishable on the one hand from the future indicative and on the other from the potential subjunctive, differing perhaps from the latter very much as the two ordinary signs of the English future, *shall* and *will*, differ from each other.

The two meanings now noticed for the Latin subjunctive, and for the corresponding moods in the cognate tongues, the subjunctive and optative, appear in different stages of development in the very earliest literary records that have come down to us from any branch of the Indo-European family, and are readily derived from the etymological meaning of the forms themselves.

Moreover it is well known that these two meanings, which for convenience we may call potential and optative, run through the whole range of Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin literature, and that in these several forms they embrace all the meanings known to the Latin subjunctive in principal clauses.

But the subjunctive, in many subordinate clauses, also belongs to our theme, as it was developed while those clauses were yet independent. Thus in *conditional*, *concessive*, *final*, and *consecutive* clauses in Latin the subjunctive is entirely independent of the character of the clause in which it stands, and was, in fact, developed before the clause became subordinate. The paper closed with an illustration of this point.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor Alonzo Williams, by Mr. S. P. Andrews, and by Professor W. W. Goodwin.

A paper by William A. Goodwin, C.E., of Portland, Maine, on "Chaucer's Cecilia," was read for the author by the President, Mr. Sewall.

This paper discuss the several interpretations of the name Cecilia (as recited in the *Seconde Nonnes Tale* of the *Canterbury Tales*), of which the commentators have taken no notice.

According to the nun's first interpretation of the name,

"It is to seye in englissh | heuenes lillie:"

i. e. *caeli lilium*, by reason of her chastity; or 'lily,' because of her whiteness of honor, vitality of conscience, and sweet savor of good fame.

In the next stanza she interprets the name as 'a way to the blind' (*caecis via*?), because by good teaching she was a guide. This derivation is far-fetched, and the vowels alone of the words thus connected agree together; but what more closely analogous words are there of the requisite meaning?

The rest of the stanza gives a derivation from *caelum* and "*lia*." Is "*lia*" Greek? *Λίαν* means "exceedingly, very much;" and *λεία* (which, when pronounced with iotacism, might be fairly represented by *lia*), 'smooth, flat,' may be conceived of with the same transition of meaning as in the Latin *plane*, German *glatt weg*, dialectic *platterdings*, and our *flatly*, and so *positively, completely*. The first part, then, says the nun, "is set for thought of holynesse;" and the second, "for hire lastyng bisy-nesse" or activity. The whole would then mean 'completely intent on holiness.'

For the nun's next hermeneutic venture,

"Cecile | may eek be seyed | in this manere

Wantynge of blyndnesse," \* \* \* \*

we may adopt the desperate supposition that *caecitatis* and sum form of *λείπω* ('to lack') floated vaguely before the poet's mind.

The nun essays, for the fifth and last time, to "expowne" the name as follows:

"Or elles loo | this maydens name bright

Of heuene and leos comth."

She adds that men might rightly call her the heaven (*caelum*) of people (*λαός*), and illustrates in detail (stanza 16) the aptness of the name in this signification. Spenser's understanding of the name may be gathered from the couplet in *Faerie Queene*, i. x. 4:

"Dame Coelia men did her call, as thought

From heaven to come or thither to arise."

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor F. A. March:

He thought there could be no doubt that the "*Lia*" of the third interpretation is Leah, Latin *Lia*, Laban's daughter, who was a familiar representative of laborious activity in contrast with Rachel, the representative of the contemplative life; as may be seen in the Latin Hymns; for example, in Bernard of Clugny's rhythm, well known in Dr. Nèale's translation under the name of "The Celestial Country" (March's Lat.



Hymnæ, p. 280); and, as Dr. Lanman suggests, in Dante (Purgatorio, xxvii, 101, and the commentators).

For the other interpretation, in which it is taken for granted by the poet that he will be understood, familiar words are to be preferred. The French *laie*, Old French *lée* with which Chaucer would associate his *aley* (alley) is better than *via* for the second interpretation; and in the fourth *lees* i. e. *-less* is better in itself than *λείπω*, and naturally leads to the *leos* of the fifth.

Professor M. W. Humphreys, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., presented in brief abstract a paper on "Certain Effects of Elision in Versification." The character of the paper involved too much quotation to admit of reading in full.

1. Diaeresis *with elision* in the middle of iambic trimeters serves as a sort of hephthemimeral caesura, the elided vowel in this case not being entirely suppressed. The author gave at length the reason why elision at the end of the first dipody can not create penthemimeral caesura (except when the elision is between two speakers), and also a reply to Hermann's objections. Elision at the middle creates caesura or *quasi-caesura*; and this may be shown by statistics.

(a) If we take the strict but false view of caesura, as explained above—page 11, we find, in verses apparently without chief caesura,

	with quasi-caesura:	without quasi-caesura:	Percentages:
In Aeschylus,	89 instances;	39 instances.	69 to 31
In Sophocles,	150    "	53    "	74    " 26
In Euripides,	315    "	101    "	76    " 24

(b) If we take the liberal and correct view of caesura, the results, tabulated as before, are:

	with quasi-caesura:	without quasi-caesura:	Percentages:
In Aeschylus,	42 instances;	19 instances.	69 to 31
In Sophocles,	44    "	9    "	83    " 17
In Euripides,	123    "	1(?)    "	99    " 01

These tables were followed by a list of instances of quasi-caesura after the first dipody, in which elision *seems* to take place between two speakers, but where there is in reality no elision at all.

2. Elision among the Romans *never being total*, the partially pronounced vowel produced less effect than in Greek where the elision was usually total; hence quasi-caesura among the Romans was unusual, except between two speakers, and then it took place after the first dipody as well as in the middle of the verse. Many examples might be given from Plautus and Terence; thus, *Casina* 352, 509, etc.; *Andria* i. 1. 7; i. 1. 92, etc.

3. The quasi-caesura was explained and illustrated by many other metrical phenomena.

4. Elision at the end of the verse. This is not employed in Latin iambic trimeters, nor in Greek heroic hexameters; but in Greek trimeters and

Latin hexameters, especially those of Sophocles and Vergil. The conditions under which it is admitted or *required* were explained, and a note was given discussing the *lengthening* as well as the elision of *-que*.

5. This section contains a full discussion of the Porsonic Law, and shows that the Greek Tragedians, before they were "emended," allowed elision to excuse the neglect of this law, the elision being *total*, and forcing or allowing the two words to be pronounced nearly as one word.

6. Discussion of the Porsonic Law among the Romans, with a special note on the metres of Seneca.

7. Relations of ictus to accent as modified by elision. See Transactions of the Am. Phil. Assoc. for 1876.

This paper is a sequel to the one on "Elision, especially in Greek," published in the Transactions for 1878, and to the paper on "The Nature of Caesura," of which an abstract is given above, page 11.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor D'Ooge, Mr. Sewall, and Professor Merriam.

A paper by Professor S. S. Haldeman (University of Pennsylvania), Chickies, Pa., "On Spurious Words," was read by Dr. C. K. Nelson.

Among the phases of words to which I have given names, is one termed *parop'sis* (implying a false view),\* due to bad writing and consequent type errors, as in printing 'Hebrides' for 'Hebudes,' where, as in other cases, the false form has been legitimised.

In the useful, condensed, and generally accurate English Dictionary of Hyde Clarke, D.C.L., we find, in its alphabetic place—"ag'nón" (for 'ag'rion,' a kind of dragon-fly) and 'inli'dan' (for 'iu'lidan,' a milliped), which Webster and Worcester give wrongly as 'iū'lidan,' with 'i,' which Webster also puts in 'iū'lus' (for 'iūlus' or 'julus'), a concurrence of long sounds opposed by a law of English speech, and seldom admissible.†

In some dictionaries, we find 'mis'gum' or 'mis'gurn,' defined as a fish like an eel in size and form. The native country is not mentioned, which leaves the language and etymology in doubt. The spellings have a Celtic ('c' as k) appearance; 'misgurn' has a Welsh look, but this language seems to give no clue. In Gaelic we find 'easgann' (an eel; 'easg,' a ditch), which, when badly written, accounts for both forms of the supposed word.

'Fr'orin' (a kind of pasture-grass), is thus given, with Italian 'fióre' (flower) as the probable etymology, which the assigned accent contradicts. The plant is a native of Ireland, and we may associate its name with Irish 'féur' (grass, fodder), 'fiurán' (a weed eaten by cattle), 'feorán' (a green, a grassy field); Welsh 'pori' (to graze), 'pawr' (pasture, grass), pl. 'porion.' Compare 'g-wyr-dd' (green), Latin *viridis*.

'Fr'orite' (a kind of mineral) follows the preceding word. Being derived

\* Outlines of Etymology. Philad., J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1878.

† Clarke gives wrongly the genus of the spider-monkeys (Ateles) as a plural, defined as 'monkeys.' The name means *imperfect*, and is in allusion to the hands, of which the thumb is incomplete, or wanting.

from 'Fiora' (an Italian localiti), the proper word seems to be 'fiō'rite,' in two syllabs.

Altho 'pregnable' is from French 'prenable,' it seems to hav borrowd the *gay* of 'expugnable.'

When 'daalder' (= dālder, the *d* educed from *l*), a Dutch form of 'dollar,' is given as da-āl'-der by the lexicographers, they invent a spurious word and demonstrate the absurditi of pronouncing foreign words, and even certain English speech-words, according to pretended "analogies" of the English alphabet.\*

A 'cūpel' (= cūpl) is a kind of cup used by refiners and by them calld cup'l and cop'l, but the dictionaris indicate the sound as cū-pel. Pryce (*Mineralogia Cornubiensis*, 1778), describes the "cuppel" and "cuppellation"—thus pronounst in the lectures of the late Professor Hare, University of Pennsylvania.

Lecturers on anatomi hav a term 'poplite'al,' which lexicographers (who do not hear anatomic terms) misred as 'poplit'eal.' So the speech-word 'either' is sometimes misred 'eye-ther.'

Formerli Worcester had 'Xāng'ti' which he markt as 'zang'te,' with English *z* and obscure *e*. This is an important word in theologic contro-versi, upon which volumes hav been writtn. The 'x' (= *sh*) is Portuguese, and the word has such spellings as 'Shang-Te' and 'Shāngtí.'

If the word 'sacciform' (= sakkiform, from sac or sack), is spoken as 'saxiform,' it should mean rock-shaped. As Latin *discus* has given 'disc' and 'dish' to English, a supposed word 'dissiform' would be spurious, because, to follow the law of English speech, the first syllab of disc-i-form shud be pronounst 'disk' or 'dish,' but not 'diss.'

In Old English, 'e' had the Europe'an power, and 'meet' was pronounst 'mate' as in 'helpmeet,' a helper, or in modern spelling—'helpmate.'

In some encyclopedias the accent of words is given, except where it is not known; but the orthoepists pretend to supply the correct sound and accent for the entire vocabulari, including such spurious forms as never had a pronunciation.

A paper by Dr. Anton Sander, of Lawrenceville, N. J., "On Greek Negatives," was read by Professor Packard, of Yale College.

This paper maintained three propositions :

1. That the sequence in Greek of compound negatives after a simple one may be more intelligible to us if we observe that these compound negatives are not disjunctives (like "neither—nor"), but correspond to "and not" or "but not," "and never," etc. They simply repeat the negative with each repetition of the conjunction, though in actual use this is sometimes overlooked and another conjunction used also.

2. The much discussed combination *οὐ μὴ* is not, as is commonly thought, a stronger, but a weaker negative than *οὐ*. It is not used where an emphatic negation would be expected, *e. g.*, in oaths, in answer to a ques-

---

\* See further upon this word and its affinities in my address, *Spelling Reform Bulletin*, No. 1, April, 1877.

tion, with the imperative, or with the present or past indicative. The *μή*, as a weaker negative than *οὐ*, can not reverse it entirely, but does so partially, and the phrase *οὐ μή* is therefore a weaker negation than *οὐ* alone, and may be translated *hardly, scarcely, not always*, etc.

3. In expressions of fear (*δέδοικα μή [μή οὐ] ἐλθῇ, timeo ne [ut or ne non] veniat*) the negative *μή* or *ne* reverses the negative idea of the verb *to fear*, thus leaving an affirmative result, "I fear he will come;" but the second negative, *οὐ* or *non*, restores the negation, "I fear he will not come." The same negative idea is expressed in Latin by *ut* alone, for then the negation in the verb *timeo* is not destroyed by a negative after it.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor Gildersleeve. The Association then took a recess until 4 o'clock.

NEWPORT, Wednesday, July 16, 1879.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Association resumed its session at 4 P. M.

Professor T. D. Seymour, of Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio, read a paper "On the Date of the Prometheus of Aeschylus."

All efforts to establish the date of the representation of the Prometheus have failed to discover convincing arguments. While Schoemann and others hold it to be the earliest of the extant plays, Moriz Schmidt classes it with the Rhesus, as the stragglers—*der Nachtrab*—of Greek Tragedy. To some the simplicity of language and construction seems to savor of the earliest times; to others it seems to be the result of Sophoclean influence. To Westphal the character of the metres seems to point to a late epoch in tragic art; to Wecklein the careful formation of the trimeters seems to indicate that the play was written before the Persians. Some think that only two actors were employed, and assign the play to an earlier period; others think that three actors were necessary, and that the play must have been produced after Sophocles had introduced the third actor. A much-quoted English authority selects for the date of representation 464 B. C., "the year when the news would reach Athens that Themistocles had entered the service of the Persian king," and refers to this act "the abomination of treason which the poet puts into the mouth of his chorus;" but another Englishman supposes that the play was intended as a glorification of Themistocles, in which case it must have been written before the Persians.

These arguments are all based upon the metre, the language, and the construction of the play, or upon some uncertain political allusion. From the very nature of the case they are inconclusive. Between the Persians and the Orestean trilogy only fourteen years passed. These were by no means the *Lehrjahre* of Aeschylus. He had been writing tragedies for twenty-eight years, and was probably fifty-three years old. While he was ready to accept suggestions from his younger rival and modify his stage arrangements, we have no reason to suppose that he materially changed

his style of composition or his metres. We have too few of his works to justify us in the assertion, from internal evidence, that one play belongs to his sixtieth year and another to his sixty-fifth year. We do not know what is accidental in the play, and what belongs to his period of work.

A surer criterion we may perhaps find in a comparison with the works of Pindar, of which Aeschylus was a careful student, as he was a student of Homer, and did not hesitate to borrow even from Phrynichus.

The resemblance between the most lyric of tragic poets and the most tragic of lyric poets has been often noted. Born in the same lustrum, educated in the schools of the same city, though widely separated by their different relations to the wars for the freedom of Greece, they were alike in their ethical views, in their magnificent and sublime style, and, as we should expect, were alike in their use of words and expressions. Thus a comparison with Pindar has emended at least one line of Aeschylus, and has explained many another.

But not infrequently we find coincidence of thought or language, which seems to be the result of conscious imitation, rather than of the like time and character of the poets. We may compare Pindar, *Pyth.* viii, 95: ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ | ἄνθρωπος, with Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 839: εἰδωλον σκιᾶς. The resemblance is perhaps as close, although not so obvious, in *Prometheus* 545 fg.: φέρ' ὅπως ἄχαρις χάρις, ὦ φίλος, εἰπέ ποῦ τίς ἀλκά; | Τίς ἐφαμερίων ἀρηξίς; οὐδ' ἐδέρχθης | ὀλιγοδρανίαν ἄκυκν' | ἰσόμενον, ᾧ τὸ φωτῶν | ἅλαδν (δέδεται) γένος ἐμπεποδισμένον κτλ.; and in *Prom.* 448: ἀλλ' ὀνειράτων | ἀλγίκοι μορφαῖσι κτλ.

But among the more specific points of resemblance between odes of Pindar and the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, the most remarkable is the description of the hundred-headed monster Typhon. Pindar, *Pyth.* i, 15 fg.: ὅς τ' ἐν αἰνᾷ Ταρτάρῳ κεῖται θεῶν πολέμιος | Τυφὼς ἐκατοντακάρανος· τόν ποτε | Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυνύμνον ἄντρον· νῦν γε μὰν | . . . Σικελία τ' αὐτοῦ πιάζει στέρνα λαχράντα· κίων δ' οὐράνιαν συνέχει | νιφέσσ' Αἰτνα . . . τᾶς ἐρείγονται μὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἀγνόταται | ἐκ μυχῶν παγαί κτλ. See also *Pyth.* viii, 16 (where we see that Typhon was not yet Aetnaean), and *Fragg.* 92, 93, Bergk. With these we have to compare *Prometheus* 351-354 fg., 364 fg.: τὸν γηγενή τε Κιλικίῳ οἰκήτορα | ἄντρον . . . δάιον τέρας | ἐκατογκάρανον . . . | Τυφῶνα δοῦρον, πᾶσι δ' ἀντέστη θεοῖς | . . . κεῖται στενωποῦ πλῆσιον θαλασσίου | ἰπούμενος ῥίξαισιν Αἰτναίαις ὕπο | . . . ἐνθεν ἐκραγῇσονται ποτε | ποταμοὶ πυρὸς . . . ἀπλάτου βέλεσι πυρπνόνον ζάλης.

That the resemblance here is beyond the workings of chance is evident; but which is the original? From the structure of the first Pythian ode, and from the cardinal importance of the mention of Typhon there, viewed in connection with the fact that it is no essential link in the chain of the tragedy, the writer of the paper considers it probable that the tragedy, or at least that passage, was written after the first Pythian ode, which is dated by Boeckh 474 B. C., but by Bergk 470 B. C. The only limitation of date for *Fragg.* 92, 93 is that the hymn from which they were taken must have been written before the death of Hieron in 467, or at all events before the overthrow of his dynasty in the next year.

In the second Pythian ode, in honor of a victory gained by the same

Hieron, we find, 93 fg.: *φέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπανχένιον λαβόντα ζυγὸν | ἀρήγει· ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι | λακτισθόμεν τελέθει | ὀλισθηρὸς οἶμος*. We find the same in substance in Agamemnon 1624: *πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε*, and in Prom. 322: *οἴκουν ἔμοιγε χρώμενος διδασκάλῳ πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἐκτενεῖς*. This soon became a proverb, but that it was not such already in the day of Pindar is shown by his treatment of it. He would hardly have developed the figure if it were not his own fresh expression.

In this same second Pythian ode, verse 11, we find: *ἐν θ' ἄρματα πεισιχάλινα καταζευγνύη | σθένος ἵππιον*, by which we are reminded of Prom. 465: *ὕφ' ἄρμα τ' ἤγαγον φιληνίους ἵππους*.

In the same ode, verse 34, in speaking of Ixion's passion for Hera, the poet says: *χρῇ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν αἰεὶ παντὸς ὄραν μέτρον. | εἰναι δὲ παράτροποι ἐς κακότηρ' ἀθρόαν | ἔβαλον*. In Prom. 890 the same thought is expressed: *ὥς τὸ κηδεῦσαι καθ' ἐαυτὸν ἀριστεύει μακρῷ*.

The paper calls attention further to the prophecy of Themis concerning Thetis, as given in Isth. viii, 34 fg., and Prom. 908-909 and 920 fg.; also to the hyporchema written for Hieron, Frag. 105 Bergk, according to the scholion on Pyth. ii, of the same date as that ode, as compared with Prom. 709-710, which seems like a dramatic development of Pindar's expression.

How are we to account for the fact that Aeschylus borrows expressions and allusions from Pindar more frequently in the Prometheus than in any other play, and mainly from the odes or hymns in honor of Sicilians?

Not long after 473-2 B. C. Aeschylus visited Syracuse, and at the request of Hieron presented his Persians. How long he remained in Sicily at that time is uncertain. We know he was again in Athens 467 B. C., when he brought upon the stage his great Theban trilogy; moreover in that very year Hieron died and his court was in confusion. During this visit to Syracuse, between 472 and 467 B. C., besides giving a new representation of the Persians, it is intimated that Aeschylus wrote his Aetnaean Women, and may well have written the Prometheus also. That the Prometheus was written after the Persians, i. e. after 472 B. C., is made probable not merely by the fact that the first Pythian ode may not have been composed until 470 B. C., but also by the probability that the satyric drama of the Persian trilogy, Prometheus the *Πυρφόρος*, was written before the Promethean trilogy.

No reason appears why the Agamemnon should not be as full of Pindaric expressions as the Prometheus, except that it was not written for the court of Hieron. In the prediction concerning the eruption of Aetna; in the mention of the smooth fields of fertile Sicily and of the monster, where, as has been remarked, it is the poet rather than Prometheus who speaks; in the warning not to "kick against the pricks;" in the exhortation to wed in one's own rank; in the Scythian wheeled houses—in all this, Hieron heard allusions to his victories at Delphi and the Epinikia of Pindar in his honor—allusions which were well understood by his court and the Greeks generally. From this, then, it seems probable that the Prometheus was written in Sicily between 471 and 468 B. C.

Professor C. H. Toy, of Norfolk, Va., read a paper "On Shemitic Derived Stems."

Professor Toy said that one peculiarity of the Shemitic family of languages is its symmetrical system of derived verbal stems, Reflexives, Causals, and Intensives. Such forms exist in other languages, but not with the regularity of the Shemitic. The latter approaches in this respect the agglutinative tongues (as Turkish, and especially Hottentot), which put out their strength on the expression of objective verbal conceptions to the comparative neglect of the subjective.

This paper offered some remarks on the general table of Shemitic derived verb-stems. First, the close similarity of those forms in all the dialects. Omitting a few rare and doubtful stems, we may infer that the system was the same in all, and that it therefore existed in primitive Shemitic. This makes it the harder to reach the original forms and meanings, since there are no different forms with which to compare these. Next, the regularity of the formation, and the simplicity of the material. The little phonetic degradation discoverable simplifies the statement, but increases the difficulty of analysis. The material falls into two divisions with two corresponding classes of significations: (1) Internal modifications of the stem by doubling a letter or a syllable, by broadening a vowel, or by inserting a weak consonant (*w, y, n*), or by combinations of these. They express intensity, or the affecting an object by the action, and are called intensives and affectives. (2) External modifications of the stem by various prefixes, *na* and *ta* making reflexives, and *sa* and *ha* (or *a*) making causals.

As to the origin of these modifications not much that is definite can be said. The reduplication is apparently symbolical, and some insertions of *w* and *y* may be referred to reduplication, while others seem to involve the addition of separate syllables. The vowel-broadening also may be symbolical. The prefixes offer great difficulties, so that we have either to assign them very general meanings (demonstrative, for example), or else to suppose that they are remnants of earlier longer forms now lost. All that seems probable is that the Derived Stems were originally nouns: we may compare them with other nouns in Shemitic, but no satisfactory results are obtained.

In the local distribution of the stems some diversities are observable. The *na* is most used in Assyrian, the *ta* in Assyrian and Aramaic, the *sa* in Assyrian and Ethiopic, the *ha* in Aramaic, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ethiopic, the reduplication and vowel-broadening in Arabic and Amharic. The north-eastern group (Assyrian-Babylonian) has the greatest development of reflexives, which, however, it often uses as passives; the northern (Aramaic) regularly makes passives of its reflexives; the central (Hebrew or Canaanitish) has made the greatest reduction in the number of the stems, but kept two passives made by internal vowel-modification, while the southern (Arabic and Ethiopic) exhibits the greatest general richness of form and signification, the Arabic alone also having a regularly-formed passive. The tendency has been to drop stems, not only in the ante-historical period, but also later.

Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., read a paper "On the English Dictionary of the Philological Society."

An "Appel" has just been issued to the English-speaking and English-reading public to read books and make extracts for The Philological Society's new English Dictionary. The dictionary has now been more than twenty years in preparation. It began with a resolution to prepare a supplement to existing dictionaries, adopted on the suggestion of a paper by Dean Trench, read in November, 1857. The work upon this opened up so many deficiencies, and suggested a dictionary so different from the old that the plan was soon enlarged, and in January, 1859, a "Proposal for a new English Dictionary" was issued. It was to be etymological and historical. The original proposal made much of the etymological side. Every body was asked to send in etymologies. But the historical side proved to be the more important. It is proposed to read substantially all the books in the language, and make quotations for all the words which occur in them. These quotations are to be made on a uniform plan, each on a slip of paper of the size of a half sheet of note paper. Those for each word will be brought together from all the books, classified according to their meaning, and arranged in historical order, so as to give the history of the word.

The work of preparing this material went on with zeal for years. The original editor, Mr. Herbert Coleridge, died, but his place was taken by Mr. F. J. Furnivall, who not only urged the work forward, but started the Early English Text Society to print and reprint rare old texts and put them into the hands of readers. Material accumulated so fast that it seemed impossible to find any publisher to print the Dictionary, and for a number of years interest in it had almost died out.

Lately, however, earnest efforts to arrange for publication have been made, and, finally, the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, in the University of Oxford, have assumed the entire financial responsibility of the undertaking. Dr. Murray, the President of the Society, will edit it, with a number of sub-editors. The letter A, four hundred pages, is to be out in 1882, and the rest is to follow in the course of ten years, if possible.

Dr. Murray finds some two tons of slips on hand. In the earliest period, when the books are few, the work is fairly done or promised; but in the later centuries, many books remain untouched. A new "Appel" is now issued for help. A thousand volunteers are asked for to complete the reading within the next two years.

American books have hardly been touched. They are all left for American readers, as are also books of British authors of the 18th Century. Four or five hundred American readers are needed in order to complete so soon this liberal allotment. Dr. Murray says that any man can help, especially with modern books; his pupils have supplied him with five thousand good quotations in a month. But of course persons who have access to original editions of authors of the 18th Century, and who have some scholastic preparation for the work, must do the most important part of it. Members of this Association are looked to with hope. Volunteers are requested to give the titles of four or five books which they have at hand and are



inclined to undertake, so that a selection may be made at once. If original editions of eighteenth century books are to be had, they are to be preferred; if not, American authors of other date are to be taken.

In American books the first thought is to secure quotations for all the words used to name the physical features, productions, and other objects, and the peculiar acts, habits, and relations to be found here. Early books of travel, law, or records are to be sought, in which such names would be likely to make their first appearance; so also books and pamphlets on natural history, surveys, and explorations.

Besides these novelties, it is to be remembered that quotations are wanted for all the common words in their common meanings for each generation. We ought to send in a large body of these from our great American authors, our statesmen, lawyers, and theologians, and our men of science, as well as our poets, novelists, and historians. Every happy expression of those thoughts which Americans most value and act upon, which can be found in print in suitable compass for quotation, may well be put upon its slip and sent to Dr. Murray, so that American thought may be fairly and fully represented in the Dictionary.

*Local Dialect* is not to be included in this Dictionary. After it is done, it is proposed to begin on a Dialect Dictionary uniform with it. Readers in the United States are notified by Dr. Murray that "they will save time by first communicating with Prof. F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, whom," he says, "we have asked to organize and guide the work of our American friends." Dr. Murray mentions that he will furnish readers with printed slips, bearing the date, author, and title of their books, so as to save mechanical labor as much as possible. The Reference list of Books at the end of the Dictionary will record the names of their Readers.

Any one able and willing to act as Sub-editor in arranging, classifying, and completing the preparation of the materials for the Editor's revision, is requested to communicate with Dr. Murray. His address is Mill Hill, Middlesex, N. W., England.

The Association took a recess from 6 to 8 P.M.

NEWPORT, Wednesday, July 16, 1879.

#### EVENING SESSION.

The Association came together again at 8.20 P. M.

Professor M. L. D'Ooge, of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., read a paper examining critically the views of Professor Kirchhoff, of Berlin, "On the Final Recension of the *De Corona*."

In the *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1875, Kirchhoff presents the following theory of the origin of the *de Corona* of Demosthenes in its present form:

Demosthenes wrote out his plea soon after the indictment was first

brought, 336-5, B. C. This plea could have been directed only against the formal complaint; beyond this nothing was definitely known of the attack of Aeschines. The original draft of the oration, accordingly, is found in §§ 53-121 plus §§ 3, 4, 8 of the Prooemium. But when the trial occurred, some six years later, Ctesiphon and Demosthenes agreed to divide the matter of the defense in such a way that Ctesiphon should make the reply to the legal points and Demosthenes should pay exclusive attention to the political issues of the case. Accordingly, Demosthenes replies to his opponent without making use of the old draft drawn up in defense of Ctesiphon, and in extemporized language. In writing out his oration subsequently, Demosthenes, in order to give completeness to the defense, recasts the old speech and seeks to engraft it upon the body of the speech actually delivered by him. Kirchhoff regards § 75 and §§ 95-101 as interjected into the body of the older speech. Demosthenes, finding it impossible to make one consistent whole out of the two speeches, contented himself with reproducing, as accurately as he could, the speech on the political issues. This later speech is contained in §§ 1, 2, 5-7, 10-52, 122-324 of the *de Corona* as we have it.

There were found, therefore, among the literary remains of Demosthenes these two distinct speeches with traces of an attempt at combination. The unknown editor of the oration in its present form completed what Demosthenes set out to do. One of the connecting links is § 9.

Kirchhoff believes that the plan of the oration and the frequent allusions to the words of the rival speech imply an acquaintance with the contents of the speech of Aeschines that argues a recasting of the *de Corona* subsequent to the trial. He further thinks that the entire passage on the peace and the embassy, §§ 9-53, was composed after the trial, and connected by Demosthenes, or his editor, with the earlier speech.

This paper aims to show that Demosthenes had reason to expect a renewal of the charges with reference to the peace of Philocrates previously made by Aeschines in the *de Falsa Legatione*, and that, excepting a few direct allusions to the words of Aeschines, there is no good reason for supposing that this part of the *de Corona* was not composed in advance of the trial.

But the main support of Kirchhoff's theory lies in the supposed relation between that part in which Demosthenes treats of his public career, §§ 53-110, in answer to the first count of the indictment, and the rest of the oration. Kirchhoff infers from the language in § 110 that when the orator composed this part of his speech he had no expectation of entering upon the vindication of his policy subsequent to the trierarchal law, Olympiad 110, 1.

The unreasonableness of this inference is shown (*a*) from the nature of the case, and (*b*) from the natural interpretation of the language in § 110 as a rhetorical artifice, when compared with similar expressions found elsewhere. From Kirchhoff's theory it must follow that the direct allusions to the words of Aeschines found in the supposed older part of the oration, sc. §§ 53-120, are more easily recognized as later insertions, and do more violence to the connection of thought than is the case with similar

allusions found in the supposed younger part of the speech, sc. §§ 10-52, 121-324. This point is fully considered. It is shown that out of the twenty-nine direct references in the *de Corona* to the language of Aeschines, eight are found in the supposed older part, and nineteen in the supposed younger part of the oration, not counting the prooemium; that the distribution of these allusions seems controlled by a predetermined arrangement of the subject-matter; and, above all, that these allusions are not any more consistent and more closely connected with the context in the part of the oration supposed to have been written after the trial, than in the supposed older part. The comparatively loose connection of §§ 126-128, 225-226, with the context is noticed. §§ 227-231 are discussed as a later insertion. The passage §§ 232-237 seems to owe its existence to an allusion in Aeschines. § 247 seems displaced, naturally following close upon § 239. § 241 seems to be a repetition of § 230; it may be that § 230 is the later passage inserted in response to the illustration of Aeschines with reference to accounts. In §§ 276-284 are pointed out clear instances of later insertion. It seems natural to connect §§ 285-290 directly with § 250, and to suppose that in the original draft the honors conferred upon Demosthenes immediately after Chaeronea were named in close connection.

The theory of Kirchhoff involves also the following difficulties: (1) There is not the slightest intimation by Demosthenes that the legal points are to be treated by Ctesiphon, or have been treated by him. (2) The dilemma is presented that either Demosthenes was not successful in giving his oration unity and finish of composition, or the unknown editor and arranger succeeded to a wonderful degree in accomplishing a task which the orator himself gave up as impracticable.

The oration is further compared with the *de F. L.* of Demosthenes, and it appears that that oration is less compact and consistent in its structure than the *de Corona*.

From a comparison with the *de F. L.* of Aeschines, which holds the same relation to the speech of Demosthenes as a rejoinder which the *de Corona* holds to the speech of Aeschines against Ctesiphon, it appears that Aeschines pursued the same course as we believe Demosthenes to have done with regard to the subsequent insertions into the body of his speech, in direct reply to the language of his opponent.

Several passages from the *de F. L.* of Aeschines are examined, to show that in its present form this speech is a later recension of the speech delivered at the trial, bearing all the marks of original unity and harmony of composition, in spite of later insertions, and presents therefore a fit parallel to the *de Corona* in its genesis and structure. A comparison with the *Timocratea* shows the wide difference between a revised speech like the *de Corona*, cast originally in a single mould, and a production like the *Timocratea*, which is plainly not a simple recension of what was originally one speech, but a combination of two or three distinct drafts, characterized by contradictions, by repetitions, and by unevenness of finish.

Professor L. R. Packard, of Yale College, New Haven, Conn., read a paper "On Geddes' 'Problem of the Homeric Poems.'"

The main difference between this theory and Grote's, with which it coincides in its division of the Iliad, is that Mr. Geddes regards the non-Achillean portions of the Iliad as written by the same poet who composed the Odyssey. This poet he regards as properly entitled to the name Homer and the traditions therewith connected, and as an Ionic Greek of Asia Minor. The poet of the Achilleid, on the other hand, he regards as earlier in time and belonging to the Dorian stock of Thessaly. The theory seems open to several objections. 1. It *assumes* the connection in time and authorship of the various Ulyssean portions of the Iliad with one another and with the whole Odyssey. 2. If it is answered that this is not an assumption but a conclusion based on proofs, it is to be observed that in many cases the proofs are found in a single book or in two or three books only, whereas the peculiarity shown by them is ascribed to the whole Achillean or Ulyssean portion of the poem. 3. This theory seems to ignore too much the influence of the poet's subject upon his choice of words and his representations of life and character. A number of the differences insisted on are probably due to the change from the comparative barbarism of war to the civilization of peace. 4. This theory, like that of Grote, fails to take due account of the inconsistencies that run through the whole texture of the poem. It emphasizes some contradictions, but ignores others of no less importance.

Professor C. H. Toy read the last paper of the evening. It was upon "Expressions of Modal Ideas in Shemitic."

I. Command: 1. Imperativ; 2. Jezma-form; 3. Imperfect in *an*. (The Imperativ probably collateral with Imperfect, and not derived from it.) II. Wish: 1. Perfect (in Arab., Eth., Phen., any wish; in Heb., a fulfilled wish); 2. Imperfect in *an*; 3. In Heb. and Aram., Imperf.; 4. In Assy., a special form, the Precativ. III. Determination of will: Imperf. in *an* (Voluntativ). IV. Purpose: Imperfect (in Arab., the *a*-form; in Eth., the shortened form). V. General result or limit: Arab., Imperf. in *a* and Perf.; Eth., both forms of Imperf. VI. Object sentences: 1. Perf. in Arab. and Heb. (real act); 2. Imperf., Arab. *a*-form after verbs of wishing, etc., *u* or *a*-form after verbs of supposing, etc., Eth. short form. VII. Conditional: 1. Ideal: Arab. Jezma-form in protasis and apodosis, or Imperf. in *an* (emphatic); Heb., Imperf. in both clauses; Eth., usually Perf. in protasis, Perf. or Imperf. in apodosis. 2. Present existing fact: Arab., Perf. in protasis, Jezma-form in apodosis (or Imperf. in *u*); Eth., as in the Ideal; Heb., Imperf. (or, sequence-construction); Aram., Imperf. or Participle. 3. Real: usually Perf. or Partecp. 4. Unreal: the same.

Thus the functions of the several forms are: 1. Perfect: pure Opt., and ideal, real, and unreal condition; 2. Imperf. in *u*: Opt., and exhibition of an act as merely an object of thought, whether condition or result; 3. Imperf. in *a*: dependence—ideal result, purpose, limit or sequence; 4. Jezma-form: Opt., command, condition; 5. Imperf. in *an*: emphatic wish, command, condition; 6. Imper.: affirmativ command.

Examination of these uses shows: (1) that the modal senses belong to both Perf. and Imperf., and (2) that they flow from the completional (Perf.) or inchoativ (Imperf.) force of the two forms. The particular employment is determined by usage, but the original sense is never lost sight of, and must always be considered in interpretation, each dialect being studied for itself under the guidance of the facts obtained by general comparison.

As to the historical development: It may be inferred from the usages of the various dialects that the mode-distinctions existed in primitiv Shemitic. The tendency has been to drop these distinctions, indeed to compress all senses flowing from the inchoativ into the Jezma or shortest form (leaving, however, the Imperativ unaffected), as is evident from an examination of the different Shemitic languages, ending with modern Arabic, which stands in this respect about on the same plane with Hebrew and Aramaic.

The Association then adjourned to Thursday morning.

NEWPORT, Thursday, JULY 17, 1879.

#### MORNING SESSION.

The Association resumed its session at 9.15 A. M.

The minutes of the proceedings of Tuesday and Wednesday were read and accepted.

In the absence of Professor Crowell, Professor March was appointed to fill his place in the committee on nominations.

The Secretary announced the election of four new members:

Mr. Winfred R. Martin, Jersey City High School, Jersey City, N. J.; Miss Mary H. Ladd, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.; Dr. B. Perrin, Hartford High School, Hartford, Conn.; Mr. Eben Alexander, East Tennessee University, Knoxville, Tenn.

The committee on the time and place of meeting recommended that the next session be held at Philadelphia, Pa., July 13, 1880; but left the matter open and subject to modification by the Executive Committee.

The Society then listened to a paper by Professor Albert S. Cook, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., entitled "Studies in the Heliand."

Since the investigations undertaken by Grein, Windisch, and Sievers to determine the sources of the Heliand, and the proportions in which they were utilized in its composition, the poem is understood to rest upon the basis of the Pseudo-Tatianic Gospel Harmony, supplemented by the commentaries of Hraban, Alcuin, and Bede.

This paper has for its object:

I. To separate those expansions or embellishments that have originated with the poet, from the body of the composition and particularly from the merely periphrastic portions to which they are adjoined or with which they are incorporated.

II. To collect and classify those passages in which the author displays his full originality, *i. e.*, is entirely independent of his sources.

These passages fall under six heads:

1. Those that motive a statement or event which otherwise would want an explanation.

2. Those that present an issue or sequence, not expressly warranted by the sources, but contained in them by implication.

3. Those that mark transition, having of themselves no distinctive character.

4. Passages descriptive of Old Saxon manners, morals, or religion, or indicative of current theological views.

5. Didactic and moral generalizations.

6. Poetic ornaments, often assuming the shape of poetic formulae.

III. To call attention to a few of the more remarkable syntactical peculiarities of the poem.

The committee to nominate officers for the year 1879-80 presented nominations as follows :

For *President*—Professor Crawford H. Toy, Norfolk, Va.

For *Vice-Presidents*—President William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; Professor Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

For *Secretary and Curator*—Professor Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

For *Treasurer*—Charles J. Buckingham, Esq., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

For additional members of the *Executive Committee*—

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Professor William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Professor Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

Professor William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The report was accepted, and the persons therein named were declared elected to the offices to which they were respectively nominated.

Professor F. A. March, chairman of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, appointed in 1875, and continued in 1876, 1877, and 1878, reported:

The Committee has not been called on during the last year for any official action. The Philological Society in England, which it was thought might appoint a Committee of Conference on the subject, has not done so. We can however report progress in the reform. The Memorial to Congress in favor of the appointment of a Commission to examine and report on the reform, and on the expediency of moving the Government of Great Britain to unite in a joint Commission, which was prepared by

members of this Committee, has been signed by representatives of more than fifty Colleges and Universities. It has also led to similar memorials from The American Institute of Instruction, and many other teachers' associations. The Department of Public Instruction of the city of Chicago unanimously resolved to correspond with other Boards on the subject. Great reading of papers and discussion of them went on all over the country at the winter meetings of the associations. Action in favor of reform has been taken by the State Teachers' Associations of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Wisconsin, Missouri, Virginia. Action has also been taken by the State Legislatures of Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Iowa. The report of the Committee of the Legislature of Wisconsin in favor of putting a phonetic dictionary in the public schools has been printed, and is an able argument for the reform. Many other reform papers have been printed in the journals, magazines, transactions of learned societies, and, within a few years, in books like those of Hadley, Whitney, Müller, Ellis. Volumes devoted to phonetics and reform have appeared from Mr. Sweet, sum-time President of the Philological Society of London, and Mr. J. H. Gladstone; pamphlets also from Prof. J. L. Johnson of the University of Mississippi, Prof. L. H. Carpenter of the University of Wisconsin, Prof. Edward North of Hamilton College. The Spelling Reform Association is to hold its annual meeting this year at Philadelphia under the most favorable auspices as a Department of the National Educational Association. Max Müller, Dr. Murray, President of the Philological Society of England, and ex-Presidents Mr. Sweet and Dr. Morris, with Rev. W. W. Skeat, Prof. of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Cambridge, and Rev. A. H. Sayce, Prof. of Philology in the University of Oxford, have consented to act as Vice-Presidents.

In England it will be remembered that in 1876 the National Union of Elementary Teachers, representing some 10,000 teachers in England and Wales, passed almost unanimously a resolution in favor of a royal Commission on Spelling Reform. More than a hundred and thirty School Boards, including those of London, Liverpool, and Birmingham united in the resolution, and the movement led to a conference in London, at which Prof. Sayce of Oxford presided, and Dr. Murray, Mr. Sweet, Dr. Morris, Mr. Ellis, Mr. J. H. Gladstone, Sir Charles Reed, and many other dignitaries of Church and State took part in the discussions. A committee from the Conference waited on the Lord President of the Council in the Department of Education with a series of resolutions. An organization of these reformers for permanent prosecution of the reform has been formed, with a Secretary and plenty of other officers, and they will publish an organ.

The National Association of Great Britain for the Promotion of Social Science, before whom the subject was brought by Prof. Newman at their last Congress, after long deliberation by a Committee, has a report before it in favor of an alternative spelling for scientific purposes, and for teaching, and to guide the progress of reform. Dr. Murray, President of the Philological Society, who has undertaken the editorship of the Society's Historical

Dictionary, wishes to have the pronunciation of that work in a key alphabet, which may be an agreed fonetic alphabet as is proposed by the Social Science Association. It is a time of rapid progress, and it seems not unlikely that some occasion may arise during the next year when a Committee of the Association may be needed. Perhaps it may be wise to continue the Committee another year.

The report was accepted, and the committee continued for another year.

The Auditing Committee reported that the accounts of the Treasurer had been compared with the vouchers and found correct. The report was accepted.

The Society then returned to the regular order of the day, and listened to a paper by Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, of the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., "On the Encroachments of  $\mu\eta$  upon  $\omicron\upsilon$  in Later Greek."

Every one who has read much Greek of the post-classic period must have noticed that the negative  $\mu\eta$  is used in various relations in which it would not be employed so readily, if at all, in model prose. It is easy enough to charge all such variations to the account of a gradual breaking down of the language, and indeed the whole matter may be learnedly despatched by calling these misuses specimens of the so-called *solecismus Alabandicus*. But such corruptions do not come in without cause. If the appreciation of the negatives was indeed so much enfeebled, we should expect the two to be interchanged pell-mell, whereas it is  $\mu\eta$  that has encroached on  $\omicron\upsilon$  and  $\omicron\upsilon$  has troubled  $\mu\eta$  comparatively little.

As a slight contribution to the history of these encroachments, I have examined anew the usage of one of the best of later Greek writers, with a view to employing the results thus gained as categories for further investigation. This author is Lucian, who was a careful student of Attic Greek, and in his *Solecista* notices not only such gross blunders as  $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\ \delta\nu\eta\sigma\eta$  but such pardonable lapses as  $\sigma\nu\eta\sigma\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu$ , so that it could hardly have been absolute heedlessness of the earlier usage; and, indeed, we find him every now and then reverting to the classic norm. The explanation is to be sought in the popular speech of the time. Lucian, man of the world as he was, avoided all affectation and followed the drift of the spoken language, so far as it was not rude or solecistic.

The classic differences between  $\omicron\upsilon$  and  $\mu\eta$  are here assumed as well known, even if not sufficiently well formulated. Between these two negatives there is a certain border land which in the classic period was occasionally invaded by  $\mu\eta$ . It is just this border land on which  $\mu\eta$  has squatted so resolutely in the post-classic time. In less figurative language, the later use of  $\mu\eta$  is not so much an innovation as an extension; and the following seem to be the lines of intrusion:

First,  $\mu\eta$  with the infinitive of *oratio obliqua*. The natural negative of the infinitive as such is  $\mu\eta$ ; and it was not until the infinitive had begun to represent the indicative that the negative  $\omicron\upsilon$  could have been tolerated. But



this toleration was established before our record, and we can now only guess at the primal state before the incoming of the future infinitive, which marks unmistakably a new function of the infinitive, just as the incoming of the future optative marks a new function of the optative. Still there is a group of verbs of saying and thinking, which retain the old negative. Such are verbs of asseveration and belief, such verbs as *ὁμνῖναι*, *μαρτυρεῖν*, *πιστεῖναι*, *πεπεισθαι* and the like. Cf. Il. 9, 132-3; Od. 5, 179; Hdt. 1, 165; 2, 179; Ar. Vesp. 1047, 1281; Andoc. 1, 90; Lycurg. 76; Dem. 21, 119, etc. So *μαρτυρῶ μή*, Dem. 45, 15, cf. 40, 47; *πιστεύω μή*, Andoc. 1, 2; Dem. 21, 221; *πέποιθα μή*, Pind. Ol. 1, 104; *πέπεισμαι μή*, Plat. Apol. 37 A. Occasionally *φάναι* and *λέγειν*, occasionally *οἰεσθαι* and *νομίζειν* join the ranks of these verbs, which involve the will, where the utterance strives to make the statement good and the thought is at once a wish; although it must be observed that grammarians have not always been careful to distinguish the legitimate use of *μή* with the infinitive in apposition, from this extended use of *μή* with the infinitive.

Now it is evident that this form of expression carries with it the emphasis of the witness on oath, so to speak, the emphasis of desire, and hence the tendency to use it in the later time, which always leans to the impressive. *Μή* with the infinitive is equivalent to "I swear," "I vow," "I bet," instead of quieter forms. How common this *oratio obliqua* *μή* is in Lucian is known to every reader of the Pantagruelist of Samosata, as George Saintsbury has happily called him.

Again in clauses with *ὅτι*, *μή* is sometimes found in classic times, a phenomenon due to the influence of the leading verb. So when the leading verb is a verb of swearing, as in the well-known passage: *οὐδ' ὁμῶσαι χρῆ τοῦδ' ὅτι μή ποτε πᾶν γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται*, Theogn. 659 (cf. Il. 10, 329), or an imper., as in the famous instance Antiphon 5, 21. But such deviations are so rare that we must not insist on them as possible misleaders. We must rather connect the *ὅτι μή* in declarative sentences with the use of *μή* with the infinitive in *oratio obliqua*. It is clear that in a period when *μή* could be used freely after a verb of saying this form *ὅτι μή* would suggest a convenient equivalent for an *oratio obliqua* expression, especially after a principal tense from which the *oratio obliqua* optative is excluded. It were indeed worth inquiry whether this form *ὅτι μή* with ind. did not help to thrust out *ὅτι οὐ* with the optative. At all events we find the opt. form of *oratio obliqua* becoming rarer and rarer.

Another important extension is to be noticed in the relative sentence. Even in classic times the negative of a relative clause is *μή* when the relative gives the notion of characteristic, and as the characteristic sometimes gives a ground, the clause with *μή* seems to be causal outright. Here the subjective element represented by *μή* would appear in standard Latin as the subjunctive. Causal relatives then began to take *μή*, and with causal relatives adversative relatives, which are thus fused with concessive relatives, and this is extended to the integral parts of the relative sentence. And not only so, but we must further take in the equivalent of the relative, the participle. So, often in later Greek, where we should expect the negative *οὐ* with a participle, we find the negative *μή*, which is a phenom-

enon analogous to the familiar Latin combination in which *qui* with subjunctive is used as a parallel for a characteristic adjective.

The widest divergency from classic usage has been touched on already, the use of causal particles such as *ἐπεὶ* (*ἔπει*) and the like with the negative *μή*. This variation is due sometimes to the *oratio obliqua* element just recognized, and sometimes to the relative characteristic, which elements run into each other. So that even here we have a development of doctrine rather than a bold and bad heresy.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor W. W. Goodwin, Professor M. W. Humphreys, and Mr. S. P. Andrews.

Professor Tracy Peck, of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., then read a paper "On the Authorship of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus*."

After briefly sketching the history of this discussion since its rise early in the sixteenth century, the speaker examined the external and internal bearings of the subject and reached the conclusion that Tacitus must have written the work.

A passage in a letter of the younger Pliny to Tacitus (IX. 10), was cited and shown to be in all probability a quotation from the *Dialogus*, and thus conclusive in regard to its authorship.

It was seen that the manuscripts of the *Dialogus* testify only in favor of Tacitus. Changes in, or additions to the MS. title of the work were shown to be of late origin, and with the evident purpose of supporting theories of a non-Tacitean authorship. Pomponio Leto's quotation from the work, as a work of Tacitus, was given as significant of the belief in the fifteenth century.

From a discussion of the probable time of composition of the *Dialogus* it appeared that there are no chronological objections to Tacitus as the writer.

A strong personal motive that may be detected in the *Dialogus*—the justification of the withdrawal of the leading interlocutor (Maternus) from forensic pursuits, and devotion to literature—was claimed to be in harmony with a natural impulse of Tacitus to vindicate his own change in literary work.

Attention was called to a like conception of life and to a consistency of judgment of men and events in the *Dialogus* and in the admitted writings of Tacitus.

The literary style of the *Dialogus* was admitted to be widely different from that of the latest compositions of Tacitus. But it was shown that Tacitus was, in his earlier years, an advocate of the revived Ciceronianism of the *Dialogus*, and it was maintained that the difference in subject and motive as well as in the age and experiences of the writer would sufficiently account for the great dissimilarity or development of style.

Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Harvard University, Cambridge,

Mass., read a paper "On Greek Verbs which add Epsilon to the Stem in certain Tenses not belonging to the Present System."

The only question raised here is a practical one of classification, and there is no thought of discussing the origin of the phenomenon. George Curtius, in his Grammar and in his treatise on the Greek Verb, includes under one class (the E class) those verbs which add  $\epsilon$  to the stem in the present, like  $\delta\omicron\kappa\text{-}\epsilon\text{-}\omega$ , and those which have no  $\epsilon$  in the present but add  $\epsilon$  in some or all of the other tenses, like  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ,  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ( $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\text{-}$ ),  $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$  ( $\mu\alpha\theta\text{-}$ ),  $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ( $\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\text{-}$ ). It is obvious that, although these two phenomena may depend on the same principle, the latter cannot be made the basis of a classification which proposes to show the relation of the present to the simple stem of the verb; for  $\mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\text{-}$  has nothing to do with the formation of  $\mu\alpha\nu\theta\alpha\nu\omicron\text{-}$  from  $\mu\alpha\theta\text{-}$ , and the stems in  $\epsilon$  have no claim to the title of "simple stems." Hadley saw clearly this weak point in the E class of Curtius, and rightly excluded from this class all verbs except those which have  $\epsilon$  in the present (like  $\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\text{-}\omega$ ), and which alone can be said to *form the present* by the addition of  $\epsilon$  to the simple stem. But he does not introduce under a single head the far more numerous class of verbs which have  $\epsilon$  in other tenses than the present. He gives under the "First Class" a list of such of these verbs as belong to this class; but, as he does not do the same in the other classes, the impression is given that the phenomenon in question is in some way specially connected with class I, although this false impression is guarded against by a remark under 331. Now the verbs of other classes which take  $\epsilon$  are nearly as numerous as those of the first class. Further, examples of this formation are found in every one of the eight classes of Curtius (except of course the seventh), and it cannot help confusing any classification to introduce into it a peculiarity which is common to all the classes already marked off on other grounds. Curtius includes in the second division of his seventh class only those verbs which would otherwise belong to the first, and those which form the stem in  $\epsilon$  from the present stem. As, now, no verb can belong to this division which does not belong also to some one of the other classes of Curtius, it is plain that it can add nothing to this classification to bring the division into it at all.

I have therefore thought it better to class the addition of  $\epsilon$  to the stem in other tenses than the present among the many modifications of the stem which are peculiar to certain tenses of verbs, like the lengthening of the stem-vowel in  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\omega$ ,  $\tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ , the insertion of  $\sigma$  in  $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\mu\alpha\iota$ , and the change of  $\epsilon$  to  $o$  in  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\omega$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\gamma\alpha$ , and to  $a$  in  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\lambda\kappa\alpha$ .

Remarks were made upon this paper by the President, Mr. Sewall.

The next paper, on the "Nomenclature of Early California," by Mr. E. L. Williams of Santa Cruz, California, was read by Prof. F. A. March.

Names of places in California or generally honorary, scriptural, or descriptiv Spanish names, or original Indian names. Honorary names

or few. Only three were mentioned: *Mendocino*, a cape, named in honor of the Viceroy of New Spain, under whom it was discovered, in 1542; *Monterey*, also in honor of a Viceroy, in 1602; *Branciforte*, also for the Viceroy, 1797.

Scriptural names are very common. Early missionaries introduced the custom of using them, and it has been followed. A large number were mentioned. Descriptive names were mentioned in still larger numbers, and many of them explained. Some of the descriptive, which appear little graphic now, were verified as having been sumtime fitting. Those explained are Spanish.

Into the Indian names the paper did not go at length.

The last paper was by Mr. Albert S. Gatschet, Linguist of Professor J. W. Powell's United States Bureau of Ethnology, Washington, D. C. It was "On Syllabic Reduplication as observed in Indian Languages, and in the Klamath Language of South-western Oregon in particular."

The author of this paper had peculiar facilities for studying the reduplicative feature of Western Indian Languages on his trip made in 1877 to Oregon. In no other linguistic family of the West studied by him does this mode of grammatical synthesis hold a more prominent place than in the Klamath language, which is also spoken by the Modoc tribe. But reduplication is common to all languages of the world, and a more profound knowledge of all the facts relating to it must prompt scholars to distinguish between two different kinds of reduplication: (a) the *iterative*, used mainly in the formation and derivation of words, and (b) the *distributive*, used for inflectional purposes. Instances were given from several of the Indian tongues, in which either one of the two kinds or both have been observed. Both kinds are very prominent in the Malay-Polynesian dialects, and Steinthal has given a very lucid exposition of duplications observed in Dayak. Fr. Müller has done the same for the Eastern and Western Malay-Polynesian dialects. In America we find *distributive* reduplication in the Flathead-Selish of Montana, in Klamath, and in the Santa Barbara dialects of Southern California. Some instances can be traced in Kalapuya and Algonkin dialects, and it seems to be or to have been general in the dialects of the Nahuatl stock (Aztec, Tarahumara, O'pata, Pima, etc.). *Iterative* reduplication exists in all the above languages, in the Maya, Yuma, and Shoshoni linguistic families, and in the Wayiletpu, Pomo, and Mutsun (Olamentke dialect). Many Sahaptin dialects, like the Warm Spring and Nez-Percé, use it to form diminutive nouns and adjectives describing the surface-quality of objects of nature. As stated above, the Klamath language is prominent in the use of both kinds of syllabic reduplication, as will appear from the following particulars:

In *Klamath* the *iterative reduplication* repeats the entire radical syllable without vocalic or consonantal changes, a few instances excepted. Reduplication of the first two syllables of the word in an iterative sense is observed only in words (nouns and verbs) commencing with the sounds

*k*, *l*, *n*, *u* (or *vu*, *w*), and some of them show a diphthong of an adulterine character, as *te-ukté-uksh*, 'long-tailed chicken-hawk.' Terms formed by iterative reduplication also assume the distributive form. We find it in onomatopoeic terms: *yáúyaua*, 'to be noisy,' *wekwékash*, 'magpie;' in frequentative and usitative terms: *níðshoníðshua*, 'to make grimaces,' *tushnúshla*, 'to shiver,' cf. Latin *titubare*; in adjectives of colors: *mets-métsli*, 'sky-blue, purple;' in adjectives describing surface-quality: *lákž-lakli*, 'polished, smooth;' in adjectives describing external shape or form: *kóhkolí*, 'round, spherical, annular, cylindrical;' in adjectives marking intensity: *litchlitchli*, 'strong, powerful.'

The *distributive reduplication* in Klamath doubles the first syllable or the first two syllables, but does not extend beyond the vowel which is included in the doubling process. A prefix may be reduplicated as well as the radical syllable; and if its vowel is short, and the reduplication monosyllabic, the vowel of the second syllable will be *a*. This grammatical synthesis prevails throughout the whole language; for not only verbs and nouns, but even most particles are subject to it. The idea of *severalty* or *distribution* is expressed by it: thus, *ktékna*, 'to cut a hole into one object,' or 'to cut holes into many articles by one single cut;' distributive, *ktektákna*, 'to cut holes into different, separate objects by cuts repeated at different times, for every object separately.' *Nép* means 'hand, hands, the hand, the hands, a hand;' *nénap*, 'each of the two hands, the hands of each person considered as an individual distinct from any other individual.' This will suffice to show that the distributive form in Klamath has nothing to do with what we call plural. No plural exists in that language as a *regular* form.

Different modes of distributive reduplication exist, all of which are dependent upon the phonetic laws of the language. Thus in *monosyllabic* reduplication we find seven different modes. (1) Regular doubling, with *-a-* in the second syllable: thus, *tiptípli*, 'dusky;' distr., *titaptípli*; *ítpa*, 'to lay down;' distr., *i-átpa*. (2) Duplication with syncope of *a*: *télak*, 'waistcoat;' distr., *téllak*, instead of *tétalak*. (3) Duplication without vocalic change: *tmú*, 'grouse;' distr., *tmútmu*; *lókanka*, 'to go astray;' distr., *loló'kanka*. (4) Duplication of diphthongal radicals: *teíni*, 'recent;' distr., *teíni*; *túexa*, 'to perforate;' distr., *tuétóxa*; *yáki*, 'seed-basket;' distr., *yá-iki*. (5) Duplication with vowel inverted: *tchuaish*, 'buzzard;' distr., *tcháchuúish*, instead of *tchú-tcha-ish*; *puélxa*, 'to throw down;' distr., *pepuélxa*, instead of *pupá-élxa*. (6) Duplication with elision of consonant: *tloxo*, 'brain;' distr., *tótlxo*; *tmókil*, 'green lizard;' distr., *tótmkil*. (7) Duplication with apocope of verbal suffix: *kshéna*, 'to carry on the arms;' distr., *kshéksha*, instead of *kshékshana*.

*Dissyllabic* distributive reduplication is subject to the same phonetic laws as monosyllabic duplication. The following examples illustrate this fact. Thus *udélgatko*, 'checkered,' has for its distributive, *ude-událgatko*; *utchin*, 'to fish with a net,' *utchi-utchán*; *udáma*, 'to cover a vase,' *udá-udma*; *udámtechna*, 'to swim on the surface,' *udúdamtechna*; *uláayue*, 'to scatter,' *ula-uliwe*; *kawakága*, 'to rip up with the teeth,' *kawakakúága*; *ibéna*, 'to dig,' *ipépa*, *ibépa*.

Both forms, the absolute as well as the distributive, go through all the declensional and conjugational inflections of the noun and verb.

On motion, it was

*Resolved*, That the thanks of the Association are due and are hereby tendered to Colonel John R. Leslie for his unwearied efforts for the comfort of the members, and to the Master and Trustees of the Rogers High School for the use of their building.

On motion, the Association then adjourned.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM, *Treasurer*, in account with the AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,  
July 9, 1878—July 14, 1879.

<i>D<sub>R</sub></i>		<i>C<sub>R</sub></i>	
Balance in Treasury, July 9, 1878,	\$461.87	Printing "Proceedings" and "Transactions," . . .	\$506.31
Fees and assessments since received,	435.00	Expenses of session at Saratoga, . . .	13.13
Sales of publications,	34.50	" " Secretary for printing, stationery, and postages,	86.18
Interest,	40.25	Expenses of Treasurer, . . .	5.25
		" " printing, . . .	1.50
		" " distributing "Transactions," . . .	18.00
		Balance in Treasury, . . .	341.25
	\$971.62		\$971.62

E. E. CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM, *Treasurer*.

There is also in the hands of the Treasurer, one Bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad Company, for Five Hundred Dollars, with seven over-due coupons of the same, of \$17.50 each, not at present collectible. C. J. B.

Having examined the above accounts, and compared them with the vouchers, we certify the same to be correct. We have also personally examined the Bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad, with seven over-due and unpaid coupons.

NEWPORT, R. I., July 16, 1879. (Signed) A. C. MERRIAM, { *Auditing Committee*.  
J. M. GARNETT, }

# OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1879-80.

---

## PRESIDENT.

CRAWFORD H. TOY.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS.

WILLIAM C. CATTELL,  
LEWIS R. PACKARD.

## SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

## TREASURER.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM.

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and—

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,  
WILLIAM W. GOODWIN,  
MILTON W. HUMPHREYS,  
J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,  
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.



## MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

---

Eben Alexander, East Tennessee University, Knoxville, Tenn.  
Frederic D. Allen, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.  
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.  
Joseph R. Anderson, Jr., Richmond, Va.  
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.  
Stephen P. Andrews, New York, N. Y.  
William H. Appleton, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.  
Albert N. Arnold, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.  
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.  
Stephen G. Barnes, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.  
Charles C. Bates, Plymouth, Mass.  
H. Louis Baugher, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.  
S. E. W. Becker, San José, Cal.  
J. B. Bittinger, Sewickly, Pa.  
Porter C. Bliss, office of "Library Table," New York, N. Y.  
James R. Boise, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.  
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Conn.  
H. C. G. Brandt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Fisk P. Brewer, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.  
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.  
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
L. H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.  
Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.  
Richard E. Call, Mohawk, N. Y.  
W. B. Carr, Leesburgh, Loudoun Co., Va.  
Franklin Carter, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Talbot W. Chambers, 70 West Thirty-sixth street, New York, N. Y.  
Henry L. Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.  
Elie Charlier (Life Member), Central Park, New York, N. Y.  
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Lyman Coleman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
George F. Comfort, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.  
Albert S. Cook, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Jacob Cooper, New Brunswick, N. J.  
A. Crittenden, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
Howard Crosby, University of New York, New York, N. Y.  
Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
Edwin De Meritte, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.

- Mrs. M. W. De Munn, Providence, R. I.  
Schele de Vere, University of Virginia, Va.  
Mary C. Dickinson, 173 Madison street, Toledo, O.  
Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.  
T. T. Eaton, Petersburg, Va.  
B. H. Engbers, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati, O.  
George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.  
Carl W. Ernst, Providence, R. I.  
Ambrose J. Faust, Washington, D. C.  
O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.  
Gustavus Fischer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.  
M. M. Fisher, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
Alexander Fleischmann, Cazenovia Seminary, Cazenovia, N. Y.  
H. H. Furness, 222 West Washington Square, Philadelphia, Pa.  
James M. Garnett, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.  
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
D. C. Gilman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Richard T. Greener, Howard University, Washington, D. C.  
James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.  
S. S. Haldeman (University of Pennsylvania), Chickies, Pa.  
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
William R. Harper, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.  
Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
B. J. Hawthorne, State Agricultural College, Corvallis, Oregon.  
Charles R. Hemphill, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.  
Theophilus Heness, New Haven, Conn.  
Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Cambridge, Mass.  
George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
E. S. Holden, U. S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.  
Selah Howell, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y.  
Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.  
John T. Huntington, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
George W. Ingraham, Sing Sing, N. Y.  
Edwin E. Johnson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
Asahel C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.  
Robert P. Keep, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass.  
John B. Kieffer, Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.  
D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
Louis Kistler, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
Miss Mary H. Ladd, Chauncy-Hall School, Boston, Mass.  
Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.  
R. F. Leighton, 109 Lefferts Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
John M. Leonard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.  
John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.  
William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.

- Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh street, New York, N. Y.  
 Merrick Lyon, University Grammar School, Providence, R. I.  
 W. G. McCabe, Petersburg, Va.  
 Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.  
 Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 D. S. Martin, Rutgers Female College, New York, N. Y.  
 Winfred R. Martin, 20 East Twenty-eighth street, New York, N. Y.  
 R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.  
 Charles M. Mead, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.  
 John Meigs, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
 Charles D. Morris, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 F. A. Muhlenberg, Univ. of Penn. (4307 Walnut street), Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Wilfred H. Munro, Bristol, R. I.  
 Joseph H. Myers, Milton-on-Hudson, N. Y.  
 C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.  
 Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.  
 Howard Osgood, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Charles P. Otis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.  
 W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.  
 E. G. Parsons, Sumner Academy, South Byfield, Mass.  
 Tracy Peck, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.  
 William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.  
 Bernadotte Perrin, High School, Hartford, Conn.  
 William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
 Noah Porter, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
 Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.  
 John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.  
 DeWitt T. Reiley, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.  
 William A. Reynolds, Wilmington, Del.  
 Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.  
 W. G. Richardson, Austin College, Sherman, Texas.  
 Ezekiel G. Robinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
 Lawrence Rust, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.  
 Julius Sachs, Classical School, 649 Madison avenue, New York, N. Y.  
 George W. Samson, Rutgers Female College, New York, N. Y.  
 A. Duncan Savage, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y.  
 Wesley C. Sawyer, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.  
 Philip Schaff, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.  
 Henry Schliemann, Athens, Greece.  
 Walter Q. Scott, Wooster University, Wooster, O.  
 Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.  
 Thomas D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, O.  
 Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.  
 L. A. Sherman, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Conn.

- Charles Short, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
E. G. Sihler, Classical School, 649 Madison avenue, New York, N. Y.  
E. Snyder, Illinois Industrial University, Champaign, Ill.  
Ephraim G. Squier, 135 East Thirty-ninth street, New York, N. Y.  
A. B. Stark, Logan Female College, Russellville, Ky.  
Benjamin F. Stem, Classical Institute, Easton, Pa.  
Frederick Stengel, School of Mines, Columbia College, New York, N. Y.  
William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.  
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.  
Austin Stickney, Florence, Italy.  
John Tetlow, Girls' Latin School, Boston, Mass.  
J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.  
William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.  
Crawford H. Toy, 43 West Twenty-fourth street, New York, N. Y.  
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.  
Joseph A. Turner, Hollins Institute, Botetourt Springs, Va.  
Milton Valentine, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.  
James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.  
Addison Van Name, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
C. Osborne Ward, 486 Adelphi street, Brooklyn, N. Y.  
Minton Warren, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
W. B. Webster, Military Institute, Norfolk, Va.  
R. F. Weidner, 1330 Franklin street, Philadelphia, Pa.  
James C. Welling, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.  
J. B. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.  
Mrs. A. E. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.  
Albert S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.  
Benjamin I. Wheeler, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
John Williams White, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.  
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.  
William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.  
J. Colver Wightman (Life Member), Taunton, Mass.  
Alonzo Williams, Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
Edwin H. Wilson, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.



The Executive Committee herewith announce that the Twelfth Annual Session of the Association will be held at Philadelphia, Pa., beginning Tuesday, July 13, 1880, at 3 o'clock P. M.

Members intending to read papers at the next session of the Association are requested to notify the Secretary at as early a date as possible.